

Resistance

Sach. 168/1

AND

Non-Resistance

STATED and DECIDED:

In a *DIALOGUE* betwixt a Hotspur-High-Flyer, a Canting-Low-Church-Man, and B----f Censor of Great-Britain.



London Printed: And Edinburgh Reprinted by James Watson, Sold at his Shop next Door to the Black-Lyon, opposite to the Lucken-Booths. 1710.

Resistance and Non-Resistance

STATED and DECIDED.

H. F. **G**OOD Morrow Mr. L. C. What are you so intent upon this Morning? Methinks you seem a little disturb'd. How can Melancholy sit upon the Brow of an *English* Man, when all things go on with such a Torrent of Success, under the auspicious Conduct of the Heroick *Marlborough*?

L. C. Why, there's the Cause of my Melancholy: To think that *English* Men can be capable of so much Ingratitude, as to find no other Object for their Envy and Malice, but this Heroe, this Patron of ours and all *Europe's* Liberty, this *British* *Scipio*, whom you and your Party seek all Opportunity to Disgrace. But I have something else that sticks on my Stomach. You have heard, no doubt, of the Alarm we had lately from *Scotland*. And tho' it prov'd a false one, yet the just Grounds we have to apprehend such an Attempt, can't but give Uneasiness to one that has any Concern or Love for his Country and the present Government. For is it now almost beyond a Probability, that your beloved Friend *Perkin* should at this Time make us another Visit, to reap the Seed of Sedition that *Sacheverell* has sowed amongst us, of which there is likely to be so plentiful an Harvest?

H. F. My Friend? D——n him. I have made a solemn Renunciation of him and all his Party, as at the Baptismal Font I did of the Devil and all his Works.

L. C. Yes, and as inviolably keeps one as the other.

H. F. Have not I taken the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance to Her Majesty, and Sworn to the Protestant Succession as by Law establish'd in the Illustrious House of *Hannover*?

L. C. Ay, but will not yet recede from an *Inherent Divine Hereditary Right*.

H. F. Have not the *H. C.* Party sufficiently testified in their many Loyal Addresses their unfeign'd Zeal for the Preservation of Her Majesty's Government in Church and State, against all Papistical and Antimonarchical Principles whatever, which you so impudently advance to the Ruine and Destruction of both?



L. C.

L. C. Alas ! Poor Wretches. And can you then still flatter yourselves with such Threadbare Sophistical Bombast, to impose upon any of the Thinking Part of Mankind ? Can Humane Nature admit of so much Impudence as with bended Knee to tell Her Majesty, in Effect at least, she has no more Right to the Crown than my *L—d M—r's Great Horse* ? That the late Happy Revolution, in Consequence of which only we enjoy Her benign Influence, was no better than a horrid, damnable Rebellion ? That the Glorious Reign of King *William* was no other than a successful Usurpation ; a continual Twelve Years Parricide ? And her own a most Unnatural Fratricide ? That the *Parliamentary Limitation* of the Succession in the House of *Hanover* is a most unjust Violation of the Divine and Humane Laws of *Hereditary Right* ? That the *Toleration*, which Her Majesty out of Her Motherly Indulgence to the tender Consciences of Her Faithful Dissenting Subjects, was pleas'd to grant with Consent of both Houses of Parliament, is a most Sacrilegious Throwing down the Pales of the Church, and a Diabolical Encouraging of Heresy and Schism ? Can you, I say, in this Seditious and Rebellious Manner, harangue Her Majesty, and term them Loyal Addressees ?

H. F. Oh ! Pox on your squeamish Consciences. You can't, forsooth, Communicate with the Church of *England* in her pure and Apostolical Rites, but will not stick to join with the Devil, to prosecute your King-killing and Republican Principles. But since you have taken the Liberty to give so Ingenious as well as Ingenious a Gloss upon the late Addresses of the *H. C. Party*, Pray give me leave to examine a little your Holy Principles and Practice so consonant thereunto. The First in Order and Dignity, and into which almost all the Rest are resolv'd, is, *Vox Populi, Vox Dei*. Thus the Soldier's cry for *Justice*, *Justice* against King *Charles I.* of Blessed Memory, was by You judg'd *Vox Dei*, because *Vox Populi*. But yet in this general Rule where it pinches your selves, I believe you'll allow of some Exceptions. For if I mistake not, *d—n the Presbyterians*, and *Burn Dr. Burgess and his Meeting-House*, was *Vox Populi*, on *Wednesday* the First of *March* last : Which you'll hardly grant to have been *Vox Dei*. And this is your *Lydius Lapis*. By this you pretend to try the Right of Kings and Princes. Now pray let us consider how much more beholden the Queen is in this Respect to You than Us. We ground Her Title upon the most Just, Sure and Ancient Foundation, that has ever

been known since the planting this Nation; maintaining Her to be the Undoubted Heir to these Realms in Lineal Succession from *Egbert*, the First sole Monarch of this Kingdom: Since whom no one even Usurper ever deign'd to derive his Right primarily from *Vox Populi*. Sometimes indeed it has been made Use of to confirm a Dubious Title; but most frequently to support a Bad one. Nor is it in its own Nature capable of giving a Title, but in a Kingdom fundamentally Elective, which but to think of here is a total Subversion of the Constitution. For how can any one go about to sue for the Approbation of the People in this Kingdom without some colourable Pretence of a preceeding Right? And certain I am, never was any one call'd from Plough to be Dictator in *England*. Yet you will allow Her Majesty no other Right than this Approbation of the People, which no Tyrant ever wanted, and was always an Appendix of the Power, not Right to the Crown. If in us to talk of *Hereditary Right*, be to tell Her Majesty she has no more Right to the Crown than my *L—d M—r's Great Horse*; what better is it in you to admit of no other Title but your Approbation, than to tell her she has no more Right to the Crown than *Oliver Cromwel* had. And I hope there's none left amongst us, who would give the Cause in Favour of *Oliver Cromwel* even against the *Great Horse*.

C. Gentlemen, The Dispute I see you so hotly engag'd in, tho' it does not come under my Cognizance, who always resolv'd to avoid so odious an Employment, as intermeddling with State Affairs: Yet as I am a Free-born Subject of *England*, and therefore nearly concern'd in the Peace and Unity of this Nation, I can't but be troubled to see it so miserably rent between two Turbulent Parties, the Re-union of which is so absolutely necessary in this present Conjunction.

L.C. Indeed, Sir, I am of your Opinion. For as Peace and Concord is the only Support of whatever Empire or Common-wealth, so is it to us now most particularly requisite, when the warchful Enemy will not fail to improve every Distraction to his Advantage; and I am sure were the H.C. as ready to concur in a firm Union in Church and State as we are, the Favourers of the *French* and Pretender would not appear with so joyful Countenances.

H. F. Oh! your humble Servant. So that the Breach of Union in Church and State must be thrown at our Door. As if not they that first desert a Church, and obstinately refuse Communion therewith,

were

were guilty of Schism and Separation, but those who did not perfidiously follow such a Desertion. No, no, it's your Duty to come back to us, not ours to follow you; and 'till then no Agreement can be hop'd for, unless this Gentleman has some new Expedient, to unite Two such distant Extreams.

Cen. I would sooner pretend to join the Two Poles; but if you'll trust your Cause to my Decision, I'll promise to be very Impartial, and if possible, satisfy both Parties.

H. F. Ay, that were something; for I believe you won't find either of us very easily satisfy'd: But for my part, I willingly submit my Cause to the Judgment of any Reasonable Man; and tho' Mr. *L. C.* never cares for any Judge in his own Cause but himself, yet I don't doubt but he'll give you Leave to comment upon him a little.

C. Then let us consider the Case fairly stated, which I believe we shall find to lie thus. You Tories call the Whiggs R—es and R—ls. You Whiggs call the Tories R—es and R—ls. This is the Dispute betwixt you. I say you are both very much in the Right.

L. C. Indeed this is, as you say, satisfying both Parties.

C. But to come nearer. You charge each other with Disloyalty; and endeavour to prove each others Doctrine and Principles contradictory to the present Government. Here also I give the Cause to both, and how just this Sentence is, a little Patience shall let you see.

H. F. Why, this truly is a very pretty Way of Deciding Causes; and did you not at the same Time dissatisfy as well as satisfy both Sides, I should very well approve of the Invention. But the Thing is so new it can't but deserve a little Attention.

C. First then, Sir, to begin with you Mr. *H. C.*— How incoherent your Principles and Doctrine are in themselves and with Loyalty to the present Government, tho' that worthy Patriot the *Review* has sufficiently shewn, I will here with some few Additions endeavour to demonstrate.

Fire and Water will sooner agree together, than an absolute Passive Obedience and Non-resistance to the Supreme Powers with the Lawfulness of the late Revolution; and yet these are Two of your Cardinal Principles. No one of you ever yet denied *K. J.* to have been your lawful Sovereign. To resist him, call in a Foreign Aid, depose him, abjure him; and still most solemnly profess Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance to Lawful Majesty, is such an irreconcilable

Con-

Contradiction in Principle and Practice, as can nowhere be parallel'd. To make the most Sacred Asseverations of honouring the Memory of the late *K. W.* and at the same Time maintain Passive Obedience, is believing you can impose upon all Mankind with a Piece of such Threadbare Impudence, as none but your selves could be guilty of. No, no, let but your Principles have their right Course, and see how naturally the Revolution will prove an horrid damnable Rebellion: *K. W.* an Usurper, a Tyrant, an *Absolom*.

H. F. Soft, Sir; you shall see we can stick to our Principles, and yet save *K. W.* and the Revolution from this black Imputation you have cast upon 'em both. *K. W.* sufficiently vindicates himself in his Declaration, where he disclaims all manner of Resistance: He only came to see Things set in a clear Light before a *Free Parliament*, and especially the Affair of the New-born *P. of W.* left by indirect Means any Prejudice should come to the Right of his Wife. And then as to us, did not *K. J.* by leaving the Kingdom very fairly *Abdicate*, and so leave the Nation at Liberty to chuse them another King; which I think with a great deal of Prudence and Justice they did. And where's Resistance in all this?

C. Oh fie! The very Repeating such Stuff as this may serve for a full Refutation. What then? The Fourteen Thousand Men, which King *William* brought over with him, regularly disciplin'd, and provided with all Military Necessaries, were by way of Retinue to grace his Visit, and shew the profound Respect he had for his Father, and particular Satisfaction for his happy Accession to the Throne, upon which he came to congratulate him with so Numerous and Magnificent an Equipage. A very dutiful Son indeed! But pray in what History do we find, that a King's flying from a Foreign Enemy, whom he was noways able to resist, and an intrag'd People for fear of his Life, of which he had so late an Instance in his own Father, was ever yet Term'd an *Abdication*? I am sure *K. Edward IV.* when he fled the Kingdom, which he could hold no longer against the Earl of *Warwick* in behalf of *Henry VI.* did not think his Right of coming again, when Opportunity offer'd, in the least prejudic'd by his Flight. Nor did any one Body think he had *abdicated*. Consider the Case, and you'll find it in every material Circumstance parallel.

But now to preach up an *inherent divine Hereditary Right*, and at the same time swear Allegiance to her Majesty, subscribe to the Settlement

ment of the Succession of the House of *Hannover*, and thereby exclude so many Hereditary Claimants to the Crown; what is it but such a gross Swearing and Forswearing as no Jesuitical Equivocation can ever solve?

H. F. Why what will you offer in Opposition to her Majesty's Hereditary Right? The Pretender? A Tyler's Son?

C. Alas! that poor Invention was never design'd for any farther Use than to serve a Turn; which it did to Admiration. And from the good Success thereof, I suppose, you think to impose upon us your modern Sophistry, more Ridiculous, if possible, than that. Our Parliament had been finely employ'd to exclude a Tyler's Son from the Imperial Crown of *Great Britain*. Methinks it had been much shorter Work to have prov'd, or at least declar'd him such, and then he'd have stood excluded of Course. But this given and not granted. What Way have you to reconcile Hereditary Right with excluding so many intermediate Heirs between the Queen and the House of *Hannover*.

H. F. A very easy one. For tho' we allow no Bounds or Limits to the *Obedience* and *Non-Resistance* we owe our Sovereign; yet is not our Opinion the same of *Hereditary Right*. We believe indeed and maintain the Constitution of this Kingdom to be a (limited, not absolute) Monarchy, descending upon the Possessor by *Hereditary Right*; which notwithstanding we say may be alienated and transferr'd by the whole Legislative Power out of one Family into another, upon urgent Occasions, such as preventing Popery and Slavery by excluding a Popish Successor. And this is no Violation, but only a Limitation of Hereditary Right.

C. Thus you think the Storm is blown over. But I'm afraid you'll find that your Contradictions, *Hydra*-like, by endeavouring to cut off the Head of one, do but Multiply the faster. You have been so free as to grant me an *unlimited Non-Resistance*, which you own to be, not only warrantable, but even commanded by the Scriptures. I can't therefore in gratitude but allow your *Hereditary Right*, *limited* and restrain'd as you desire. As for the *Revolution* you never remember it, but with a grateful Acknowledgement of God's particular Favour in crowning it with Success. Now then, unless these Three, a *limited Hereditary Right*, an *unlimited Non-Resistance*, and the blessed

Revolution be brought into perfect Harmony ; what is your Doctrine but a most dissonant Jangle ? A

Non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum ?

Let us see then how exactly they agree. *Non-Resistance* is the Precept of God : *Resistance* upon whatever Account, a Work of the Devil : The *Revolution* never was nor could have been brought about but by *Resistance* : What then follows but that 'till Heaven and Hell, God and the Devil be united, the *Revolution* and *Non-Resistance* will never join Hands together. *The Hereditary Right*, which you allow of, you say is not *unlimited*, but *alienable* by the *Legislative Power*, as it is actually *alienated* and *transferr'd* into the House of *Hannover*, but this *Translation* did most indispensably depend upon the *Revolution* ; that, as before, upon *Resistance*, that is to say upon *Rebellion* and *Usurpation*.

For now to shew how fond and frivolous an Evasion the *limiting* of *Hereditary Right* is to you who so obstinately patronize *Non-Resistance*, do but consider ; that this *Limitation* and *Alienation* must be an Act of no less than the *whole Legislative Power* consisting in this Kingdom of the Lords and Commons as Body, and King or Queen as Head thereof. Whence as a Humane Body is incapable of any *Vital Act* without the Head ; so are the Lords and Commons incapable of any *Legislative Act* without the Concurrence of King or Queen their Head. And as in Defect of the Natural Head of a Humane Body, to substitute an artificial one of Wood or Stone, would never restore the Body to the Exercise of its *Vital Faculties* ; so neither in Defect of the Natural, that is lawful Head of the State, to set up an Artificial, that is unlawful one, can ever restore the Body Politick to the Exercise of its *Legislative Power*. For this Reason all the Acts of Parliament during the Reigns of the Three *Henrys*, but more especially those in Prejudice of the House of *Tork*, were accounted void and null in the Reign of *Edward* the IV. Now if your Doctrine of *Non-Resistance* be so sacred and inviolable as you say it is, then was K. J. most unjustly depos'd, and thereby the State left a *Headless Trunk*, a *Breathless Carcass* ; which not the kind Influence of the P. of O. or even her present Majesty can ever enliven or render capable of any *Legislative Act* whatever, much less that of *limiting Hereditary*

ditary Right, and altering the whole Frame of the Succession. See now here the blessed Fruits of your *Non-Resistance*: The Revolution prov'd a Rebellion. The Settlement of the Government for the present Usurpation, and for the future a Continuation of old with an Addition of new Injustices to the only lawful Heirs of the Crown. And when you and your Party don't stick to advance this seditious Doctrine in the very Face of your Sovereign, who may not justly charge you with Disloyalty to the Queen and Government?

Now Mr. L. C. I'll proceed to the second Part of my Sentence, and endeavour to shew that you and your Principles are not less coherent with, but far more pernicious to, not only to the present, but all Civil Government whatever, than those of the H. C. already examin'd.

L. C. How you'll make that out I can't comprehend. For seeing we and our Principles are as directly opposite as White and Black, whatever serves to *vilify* one Side must undoubtedly *verify* the other.

C. Far from it. For you and your Principles do most rarely exemplify the Truth of that *Logical Axiom*: That two Contraries can never be *simul vera*, but may be, and are most frequently *simul falsa*.

For give me but Leave to anatomize your Address as you do those of the H. C.— To make Protestations of sincere Loyalty to her Majesty, and yet deny her all Pretence to *Hereditary Right*, or any other *Title*, except your *Bounty*; what is it but to tell her? *Madam*, Remember you are our Handywork, our Poppet, of our setting up, and unless you behave your self accordingly, must expect to be of our pulling down. Been't puff't up with the Vanity of a Crown and Scepter: They are but glittering Toys, meer childish Baubles. As for Majesty, that's an obsolete Thing, an empty Sound. The Substance that is the Power is wholly and solely in us. We prescribe Rules, 'tis your Duty to follow 'em. We are the Lords and Masters, you the Subject. We have indeed condescended so far as to place you upon the Imperial Seat, because it was convenient so to do. But if you pretend to take upon you any farther, look to your self. Your Grandfather had an undoubted *Hereditary Right* independent of our Will and Pleasure (which you have not): But when he once came to clash with our Interest, nothing but his Head could

expiate the Crime. The good old Cause is still in full Force and Vigour, for which you know we would not stick to Re-Crucify our Saviour.

L. C. You would make us fine Fellows indeed. But pray from what Address of ours have you gather'd these Loyal Expressions?

C. The Words I don't charge upon you. But that this is the genuine Construction and natural Consequence of your Principles and Doctrine appears as clear as the Sun. You pretend indeed, no less than your Adversaries, to harangue her Majesty after a most Loyal manner. Call her dread Sovereign; vow the most unfeign'd Zeal for the Preservation of her Person and Government; and promise the most dutiful Respect to her Laws and Ordinances. But as Non-Resistance gives them the Lye, so does Resistance give it you. That brands the *Revolution* with the Mark of *Rebellion* and *Usurpation*. This on the Contrary sets it on such a Foot as to authorize from thence the Deposing her present Majesty and crowning even the *Pretender* tho' a *Tyler's Son*. For if to vindicate the Revolution we must have Recourse to Resistance, what better Security can we give her Majesty against being resisted, than her Father had? Or rather do we not countenance and abett all Sedition and Rebellion whatever even against her tho' the best of Princes? The most impudent of Rebels never resisted for resisting Sake. They always found some Pretence or other; and were it as threadbare as the Cavil of the Wolf with the Lamb in the Fable, yet would it serve to justify a successful Rebellion.

L. C. How can that follow from us who never allow of Resistance but upon just and warrantable Grounds?

C. But who is to judge of the Justice and Lawfulness of your Motives? I'm sure for your parts, you'll stand to the Judgment of no Body but your selves. And who ever cry'd stinking Fish? Who calls himself a Rogue? The Nature of the Dispute indeed is such, between a King and his resisting Subjects, as to admit of no third Person for Judge, the Decision depending intirely upon the Success; so that if the Subjects prevail, they'll take upon themselves to judge and pronounce all that they have done to be just and lawful. But if the King, then they must expect him to give Sentence, that resisting in the Subject, however groundd upon the colourable Pretexs of redressing Grievances, or restoring lost Liberties, is still a wicked Rebellion;

nay

may he'll appeal to the Laws for Confirmation thereof, where we find that compassing or imagining the Death of the King, testify'd by Overt Acts, such as resisting or levying War, against him upon whatever Account (for the Law makes no Exceptions) is damnable Treason. Whence it follows, that either we shall have all *Resistance*, tho' in Defence of sweet Liberty, in opposing Popery and Slavery, nay tho' for preventing Mahometanism and Pagan Infidelity, most irrevocably condemn'd, and that by Law too: Or on the contrary we shall have all *Resistance* justified, tho' in the worst and most wicked of Rebels against the best of Princes.

You Whigs are pleas'd to ridicule the Tories for preaching up *Non-Resistance*, and practising *Resistance*; and with very good Reason: For certainly pulling down the Meeting-Houses in the late Tumults; insulting the Queen's Guards when upon Duty; endeavouring to stop the Course of Justice; Crying up for a Patriot one condemn'd as a Delinquent, was a most preposterous Way of *Passively obeying* Her Majesty, and shew'd an uncommon Fervour for Non-Resistance. But may not they return the Argument upon you? With what Colour of Justice could you, abetting and commending that damnable Doctrine of Resistance, call to Account and condemn the late Rioters for Resisting? Was it not as prevalent and warrantable a Motive, to see a Minister and Champion of the Church of *England*, dragg'd from the Pulpit, impeach'd of High Crimes and Misdemeanours, and in Danger of being condemn'd for no other, (as they thought) than preaching the true Doctrine of the Church; as it was formerly to see the Lights of the said Church, the Bishops, sent to the Tower? And might not Dr. *Burges's* Meeting-House be as great a Nuisance as *Lime-House* Chapel?

L.C. Ay, now you begin to explain your self. I saw indeed from the Beginning that this was your Drift, but did not expect you'd have made so open a Declaration. Our Cause is like to have a good Issue with one who so avowedly espouses Popery and the Pretender.

C. Very pleasant! As if one could not oppose a ridiculous Opinion by shewing the Absurdities that attend it, without becoming chargeable therewith. No, no, I have nothing to do with Popery or the Pretender. My Business is only to shew what an Inlet your Principle of Resistance gives to all manner of Seditious, Tumults, Riots, and Rebellion. In vain have our Ancestors compiled so many wholesome

Laws, erected so many upright Courts of Justice, if we are at Liberty to scorn, deride and resist 'em when we please.

L. C. No, we abhor such a Thought. 'Tis in Vindication of Justice that we *Resist*. When the due Order thereof is perverted: when Juries are pack'd: Men of fear'd Consciences made Judges of the Innocent: Then may we lawfully and laudably Resist, not Justice but the Abuse of Justice. When *Sic volo, sic jubeo* is our Sovereign's only Rule: When the Fundamental Constitution is in Danger of being subverted: When Popery, that is Superstition and Idolatry, is prefer'd before the true Spirit of the Gospel: Then and only then may we resist, not Majesty but Tyranny and Oppression, not the Government, for that we always disavow, but Arbitrary and Wicked Governours.

C. This I grant was your Plea for Resisting. But this also, or to this Purpose, was the Plea of the *Anti-Burgesses*. And this or something as plausible, will be the Plea of all Rebels how impudent soever. And since as you will allow of no Judge in your own Cause but your selves, so neither can it be expected that those who copy after you should. What follows, but that henceforth all Rebellions must be pronounc'd Just and Lawful? Nor will that subtle Distinction betwixt Governour and Government afford you any Relief; tho' you flatter your selves that by it all Authorities are fully answer'd, all Arguments eluded. I believe you'll shew me very few Instances of any Government that did not think it self resisted, if even its inferior Governours or Magistrates were oppos'd in the Execution of their Office. How then a King, who is Supreme Governour in all Monarchical Governments, shall be Resisted, Depos'd and Murther'd, without any Violence offer'd to the Government, I can't comprehend. Perhaps indeed I mayn't understand the abstruse Meaning of this Distinction. I believe neither do you your selves.

L. C. Methinks, Sir, you are a little too hasty in passing so rash a Censure upon us. Have a little Patience, and I don't doubt but to satisfy you that the Government may be so distinguish'd from Governour, as to reconcile *Resisting* the one, with *Non-Resisting* the other. By the Government we mean the Fundamental Laws and Constitution of a Kingdom, according to which the King ought to rule his People, and which he is no less oblig'd to observe and obey, than the meanest Subject is him; nay and for Breach whereof he is no less accountable.

accountable to the People or their Representatives the Parliament, who are as it were, Guardians or Trustees of those Laws and Constitutions, than are his Subjects for Breach of any of his Laws and Ordinances. Now is it not beyond a Contradiction, that in this Sense the Governour may be resisted and not the Government? For that a Prince may sometimes exceed the Bounds of Sovereignty, and not only not observe but endeavour to subvert the Laws and Constitution of his Kingdom, fatal Experience has too often taught us; and that in such a Case we not only may but must resist our Prince in Defence of the Government, and reduce him to the Observance thereof; or if that be impracticable, depose him and substitute another, of whose good Behaviour we may be more secure, Reason dictates, and several Precedents from our own History do sufficiently warrant. King *Edward II.* by whose Mismanagement all Things were miserably gone to Wrack, was depos'd by the Parliament and forc'd to resign. King *Richard II.* for the same Reason was oblig'd by Parliament also to undergo the same Fate.

C. You might have added a third Instance, more pregnant than either of these in King *Charles I.* who likewise for Male-Administration and Breach of Fundamental Laws and Constitution, was not only depos'd but condemn'd and murdered. But if this be the true Explication of your Distinction between Governour and Government, to what Purpose is it made use of in the Dispute of Resistance and Non-Resistance? We'll suppose all you say is Orthodox, that the King is accountable to his People or their Representatives the Parliament; contrary to that receiv'd Principle, That *the King is answerable for his Actions to God alone*: We'll grant that King *Edward* and *Richard II.* were lawfully depos'd by the Parliament, nay and that King *Charles I.* was justly put to Death as a Traitor to his Country. What will you infer from all this? If the King be accountable to the Parliament or Government, which of the Two is the Supreme Power? To say the King, is most preposterous; and to say the Parliament, is to say nothing to the present Dispute. Who ever contended for *Non-Resistance* in a Superiour to his Inferiour? Who ever alledg'd *St. Paul*, commanding *every Soul to be subject and obedient to the supreme Powers*, to prove that the Supreme Power might not resist and depose its inferiour Officers or Governours? Who ever doubted but that the Senate of *Venice* might call to account and displace the *Doge* for Mismanagement,

ment, or the States of *Holland* their Stadtholder? Who ever deny'd that a King or Queen might turn out their subordinate Ministers, such as Secretaries of State, Treasurers or the like, without violating that Sacred and Inviolable Doctrine of *Non-Resistance*? And if the Government be as you say, Superior to the Governour, what is it to our Purpose, to say the Governour may be resisted by the Government? What ridiculous Trifling is it in you to explode and condemn *Passive Obedience* and *Non-Resistance* to the Supreme Power (for that is the real Dispute, no one limits it only to a Kingly Government) because you think you can shew a Power Superior to the King, to which consequently and not to him you say absolute *Non-Resistance* is due?

From what has been said on both sides, may be made this short Observation. The *H. C.* Preach up an *unlimited Non-Resistance*, but *Resist* when they please. The *L. C.* allow of an almost *unlimited Resistance*, but Hang, Draw and Quarter for *Resisting*. That is, with the *H. C.* to *Resist* in any but themselves is damnable and diabolical. With the *L. C.* to *Resist* any Superior Power but theirs, is Meritorious and Praise-Worthy. This is a very short, and indeed the only Answer I can find to all the Absurdities and Contradictions, I have advanced against either Party: But let any one examine the Validity, the Justice and Equity thereof, and I dare be Confident he'll soon agree with me in my former Verdict, that you are both equally *R——s* and *R——ls*.

L. C. And this is to your final Determination of the Controversy. Indeed I must confess you have been, as you promis'd, very impartial in your Judgment. There is little Suspicion of Bribery from either side. You have been very plain with us both. But what must we do then? Neither Resist nor Obey? What Medium can you give us? You say you are a Free-born Subject of *England*, a true and sincere Protestant I don't doubt. You must therefore grant the Revolution to have been Just and Lawful. As for the Dispute of *Resistance* and *Non-Resistance* I don't see how in this present Conjunction it will admit of an Indifferency or Logical Precision. Be then so frank as to disclose your own real Opinion in the Matter, for hitherto you have kept your self altogether reserv'd, and which side you close with. If *Non-Resistance* Pleases you best, shew me but how to reconcile that with the Revolution (which I believe you'll hardly do, after the many

many Absurdities you have proved against it) and I'll willingly join Hands with you. But if *Resistance*, then I hope you'll be so just to your self as to retract all the hard Censures you have pass'd upon it.

C. So, Sir, you think you have caught me now, and concluded me in an unanswerable Dilemma. But I shan't I hope find it so difficult to escape as you imagine. In the first place, I can't but take Notice here of a very cunning Insinuation of yours; which is, that you would be content to supersede the Doctrine of *Resistance*, could you but see how the *Revolution* might subsist without it, as if you had taken it up only out of Honour and Respect to the said *Revolution*. But if we look back a little and examine your Transactions from Forty One downwards, we find this your beloved Principle of a much older Date than the *Revolution*. What then? You anticipated it, I suppose, and laid the Way open for it beforehand? How you could fix it in particular, without the Spirit of Prophecy, I don't understand; but that you have done it most effectually, for all in general does undeniably appear.

Now for your Dilemma. I don't design to take upon me here to justify the *Revolution*. It does not need so mean a Patron as I am. Nor do I think my self obliged to pass any Judgment upon it, in order to prove what at first I undertook, that you as well as the Tories were guilty of most irreconcilable Contradictions in Principle and Practice. But by the by, I think the *Revolution* is in a very miserable Condition, if its only Support is *Resistance*. When we are reduced to that Extremity, as to have no better Warrant for deposing the Son, than Beheading the Father, I'm afraid the Difference between Death and Exile will prove but a very Trivial Excuse. If the Consequences of the *Revolution* are to be a Precedent to all future Rebellions: If by it is abolished, *Hereditary Right* the so long Fundamental Constitution of the Kingdom: If Monarchy must no more take Place, but the whole Power be vested in the People, that is in a particular Faction: If these, I say, are the Effects of the *Revolution*; let us but consider the Condition we were in before, and compare with our present Circumstances, and I'm afraid we shall find the Change very little for the better. We were then running Headlong into Popery and Slavery; we were at the Brink of being oppress'd by an Arbitrary and Tyrannical Power; our Laws and Con-

stitution

stitution violated. But how is all this remedied by the *Revolution*? Alas! *Incidimus in Scyllam* has been our Fortune. We have fallen from one Extreme to another far more dangerous, if possible. To preserve our Laws and Constitution inviolable, we have totally subverted them. King *James* only went about to alter them from what they then were, to what they had been before for above 700 Years together, from *Egbert* to *Edward VI.* To prevent this, we have Changed them to what they never were since the Creation of the World. That we might the more effectually exclude Popery, we retain or farther introduce the very worst of its Principles, to wit, that damnable Jesuitical Doctrine of Killing and Deposing Kings, with this Difference, that the Papiests place the Power of deposing Kings only in the Pope, whom they look upon to be their Superiour: But we most proposterously allow it to the meanest and basest of his Vassals and Subjects. In fine, we have pull'd down the Tyrannical Power of a Monarchy to set up the Babylonish Confusion of an Anarchy. A Blessed Change!

From hence you may easily gather an Answer to your Dilemma: that if as a true Protestant, I must needs subscribe to the *Revolution*, I shall neither chuse *Non-Resistance* nor *Resistance* as they are maintain'd by your Two Parties, since both are equally Destructive to and inconsistent therewith: That by directly condemning it as a Rebellion, this by a Side-Blow and a Posterior; bringing it in attended with a long Train of direful Effects, which, but to have thought of, would be an Impiety.

F I N I S



